

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

HARISADHAN PATRA, *et al.*,

Plaintiffs,

v.

PENNSYLVANIA STATE SYSTEM
OF HIGHER EDUCATION, *et al.*,

Defendants.

No. 4:14-CV-02265

(Chief Judge Brann)

ORDER

SEPTEMBER 2, 2025

Currently pending before the Court is Plaintiffs’ motion to alter or amend the judgment and motion to take judicial notice of certain facts.¹ Plaintiffs primarily argue that fraud was committed by Defendants when they purportedly submitted false evidence to the Court in this matter.²

“A court may set aside a judgment based upon its finding of fraud on the court when an officer of the court has engaged in egregious misconduct.”³ The United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit has held “that such a finding must be supported by clear, unequivocal and convincing evidence of (1) an intentional fraud; (2) by an officer of the court; (3) which is directed at the court itself.”⁴ “In addition,

¹ Docs. 117, 124.

² Doc. 119.

³ *In re Bressman*, 874 F.3d 142, 150 (3d Cir. 2017) (internal quotation marks omitted).

⁴ *Id.* (footnotes and internal quotation marks omitted).

fraud on the court may be found only where the misconduct at issue has successfully deceived the court.”⁵

Plaintiffs’ motion—which borders on nonsensical—fails to sustain the heavy burden required to prove fraud on the court, and the Court finds no evidence in the record to support the allegations of fraud. Nor is this Court able to discern from the record “any other reason that justifies relief.”⁶ Accordingly, **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that:

1. Plaintiffs’ motion to alter or amend the judgment (Doc. 117) is **DENIED**; and
2. Plaintiffs’ motion to take judicial notice (Doc. 124) is **DENIED**.

BY THE COURT:

s/ Matthew W. Brann

Matthew W. Brann
Chief United States District Judge

⁵ *Id.*

⁶ Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b)(6).